DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 420 HE 028 856

AUTHOR	Sima, Celina M.; Denton, William E.
TITLE	Reasons for and Products of Faculty Sabbatical Leaves. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE	Nov 95
NOTE	23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (20th, Orlando, FL, November 2-5, 1995).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Faculty Development; Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; *Productivity; Research; *Sabbatical Leaves
IDENTIFIERS	*ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This study examined the reasons for and products of faculty sabbatical leaves, using data from 193 approved sabbatical applications and 125 sabbatical reports submitted between 1991 and 1993 at a public research university in the midwest. It found that of the 193 successful applicants, 164 actually completed the sabbatical, and that approximately 3.8 percent of the institution's faculty were on sabbatical at any one time. Most of the faculty indicated in their application that they intended to use the sabbatical primarily to conduct research (49 percent) or to write (21 percent). In aggregate, the 125 faculty who submitted post-sabbatical reports indicated that the following products were directly attributed to the sabbatical: (1) 42 books or manuscripts; (2) 26 book chapters; (3) 4 monographs; (4) 91 published articles; (5) 65 papers submitted for publication; (6) over $1.3 million in secured research grants; (7) 36 grant proposals submitted; (8) 94 talks, presentations, or invited lectures; (9) 13 new or revised courses developed; (10) 2 music compositions; (11) 1 conference; and (12) 1 analytical report. The results of the study are discussed in light of recent criticisms of faculty productivity and the value of sabbaticals. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 420

Reasons for and Products of Faculty Sabbatical Leaves

Celina M. Sima

William E. Denton

Dr. Sima holds a Courtesy Assistant Professor position in the College of Education and also serves as Associate Director for Resource Administration at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Dr. Denton serves as Resource and Policy analyst at the University of Illinois at Chicago and is an Adjunct Professor at DePaul University.

HE 028 856

Presented to the Association for the Study of Higher Education, November 2-5, 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Marriott Hotel, Orlando, Florida, November 2-5, 1995. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

The Reasons for and Products of Faculty Sabbatical Leaves

During the past two years the sabbatical, or faculty leave with pay, has been scrutinized more closely by state legislators across the nation as part of the on-going discussion of faculty productivity. While the questions raised by legislators and other stakeholders challenge the need for the sabbatical leave, more than any particular issue, the debate reveals that those outside of academe have a paucity of information regarding the nature, purposes and benefits of the faculty sabbatical. In an attempt to provide clarification this policy study: reviews the definition and purposes of the sabbatical that have been revealed in the higher education literature, in order to establish a framework for analysis; examines sabbatical leave through a content analysis of the actual applications and leave reports of a university faculty cohort who took sabbatical leaves during the 1991, 1992 and 1993 academic years, in order to establish a statement of purpose and to determine the scholarly benefits of the sabbatical; and based on these findings, provides recommendations for future policy and procedure in order to improve the sabbatical leave process for the mutual benefit of the faculty member and the institution.

Sabbatical Leave Defined

Before investigating the purposes and benefits of the sabbatical leave it is useful to consider the definition of the sabbatical. In the Dictionary of Education, Carter V. Good (1959) defined the sabbatical as "a plan for providing teachers with an opportunity for self-improvement through a leave of absence with full or partial compensation following a designated number of years of consecutive service." Kenneth J. Zahorski (1994), in The Sabbatical Mentor found this definition particularly useful, but added two other distinguishing characteristics of most sabbatical policy statements: a required return to service, and the filing of a sabbatical report. The combined characteristics identified by Good and Zahorski make up the critical elements of the faculty-institution sabbatical agreement for the purposes of this study.

Institutional Context for the Study of Sabbatical Leave

It is important to note that while the definition of sabbatical helps in identifying the critical elements of the sabbatical agreement, the specific conditions and procedures of the sabbatical must be elaborated by each institution through a sabbatical policy statement.

The institution being studied is a public, urban, Research 1 university in the Midwest. It serves almost 26,000 undergraduate, graduate and professional students and has between 1,400 and 1,500 tenured and tenure-track faculty. There are 14 colleges, and the academic programs vary widely from liberal arts and sciences to engineering and business administration, plus a full complement of health sciences.

The faculty handbook of the institution in which the study was conducted states that a member, assistant professor or above, who has served the University for a specified period on a full-time appointment as an instructor or above since his or her original appointment or since the termination of his or her last leave on salary, may be granted a sabbatical leave of absence with pay for the purpose of study, research, or other pursuit, the object of which is to increase the individual's value to the University. The leave must be recommended by the head or chairperson of the faculty member's department with the concurrence of the dean of the college (or on recommendation of the dean or director of an independent campus unit), and is subject to approval by the chancellor, the president, and the board of trustees.

The following sabbatical leave options are available for faculty members on **nine month** appointments:

1. After eight appointment years of full-time service:
    a. two semesters at two-thirds salary or
    b. one semester at full salary.
2. After six appointment years of full service:
    a. two semesters at half salary or

b. one semester at full salary.

3. After four appointment years of full-time service:

   a. one semester at two-thirds salary

4. After three appointment years of full-time service:

   a. one semester at half salary.

There is also a similar schedule for faculty on twelve month appointments. After a sabbatical leave, credit toward the sabbatical begins to accumulate at the beginning of the next semester (for faculty members on nine-month appointments, or the next month for those on twelve month appointments) upon the faculty members return to full-time service.

No one to whom a sabbatical has been granted is permitted to accept remunerative employment or engage in professional practice or work for which he or she receives pecuniary compensation. A faculty member while on sabbatical may accept a scholarship, fellowship or grant for the purpose of study, research or scientific investigation provided that the acceptance does not impose duties and obligations incompatible with the purpose for which sabbatical leaves of absence are granted.

A member of the faculty to whom a sabbatical leave of absence has been granted must agree to return to the University on the expiration of the leave and to remain in its service for at least one year there-after; and the University, on its part, will agree to retain the faculty member in its service for the period at least one year after his or her return from sabbatical.

The process for seeking sabbatical leave involves the following steps:

Prepare an Application for Sabbatical Leave of Absence form, and a sufficiently detailed statement about the proposed program of study or travel and the type of supplementary financial aid to be received or applied for.

Transmit this material to the head of the department who in turn forwards the application for approval to the dean of the college and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The application is then forwarded to the Campus Research Board for evaluation and recommendations.

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs transmits the applications with recommendations to the Board of Trustees. (Applications will not be approved if any additional costs to the university are involved.)

Upon the faculty member's return from sabbatical leave, he or she is required to submit - through the appropriate department head or chairperson and dean or director - a report to the chancellor on the work undertaken during the sabbatical.

Policy Implementation and Criteria for Selection

The policy clearly spells out general sabbatical leave eligibility, conditions and institutional expectations, however, within each institution there are judgment calls that must be made, particularly at the departmental level. These decisions make up the informal aspects of the formal policy and are important considerations when analyzing policy or considering the applicability of policy recommendations to other institutions.

We interviewed the Vice Provost to obtain additional details about policy implementation. We focused on the process employed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences because the

largest proportion of faculty taking sabbatical leave come from that college. The process begins when the faculty member submits the prepared application to the unit department head, who then must apply some criteria in selecting applications to be sent forward for further consideration. The first task is to verify eligibility. If the applicant is eligible, the department head then considers the merits of the leave request. (e.g. Do the proposed sabbatical activities require the kind of time, attention and freedom of movement that a sabbatical affords? -- or, could the proposed activities be accomplished within the typical research, teaching and service role of the regular faculty contract?)

Due to the fact that the department heads must also ensure that the appropriate level of staffing is available to carry out the functions of the department, there is also consideration of the financial burden on the unit. For example, if the leave is taken at 50% of salary, then funds are available to cover some teaching, research or service responsibilities. If the leave is for 100% then there may be some real cost to the department if the faculty members responsibilities must be carried out by someone else. By policy, the university will not incur costs to support a sabbatical leave. As a result, the department head must then consider the individual request within the context of the total requests being considered for that year. The general policy within the Liberal Arts and Sciences College is that no more than 12-15% (depending on the department) of the faculty may take a sabbatical leave in any given year.

Because of the number of years of service required to be eligible for sabbatical, the policy favors approval of leaves for senior rather than junior faculty. Of all of the faculty approved for sabbatical leave in the years examined in this study, only three were assistant professors.

After unit review, the department head forwards the list of faculty recommended for sabbatical leave to the College Executive Committee. The committee uses similar criteria to prioritize the list of recommendations that are forwarded to the College dean.

We asked the Vice Provost if many applicants were rejected in this process. He indicated that in fact, very few are turned away for reasons of merit, and that conflicts surrounding funding or human resources are more often resolved by the phasing of sabbatical leaves over a couple of semesters or years rather than rejection of the leave request.

Documented Purposes of the Faculty Sabbatical Leave: A Framework for Analysis

The research emphasis of the American university became focused on the dissemination of new knowledge in the late 1800's. In The American College and University: A History, Frederick Rudolph (1962) points out that Johns Hopkins led the way in 1877 with the founding of *The American Journal of Mathematics*. Soon after, Johns Hopkins also added journals in chemistry, biology, physiology, psychology, and philology. The University of Chicago faculty were the founders of scholarly journals in political economy, geology, Hebrew, astrophysics, sociology, theology, and classics. By 1898, the number of copies of University of Chicago journals printed in a year totaled 150,000. Efforts at other institutions followed as well. During this time faculty were encouraged to generate publications, and to assist in the process, the paid leave of absence, or sabbatical, was developed. According to Rudolph, by the 1890's the sabbatical leave was quite common, and faculty members knew that in return for "months of relief from university duties" they were expected to return with fresh journal articles, a new laboratory discovery, or a book. In essence, the sabbatical was encouraged as a means of increasing scholarly productivity.

While Rudolph's description sounds familiar to that of the sabbatical leave one hundred years hence, Bowen and Schuster, in American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled (1986) present a second and broader description, referring to the sabbatical leave as an opportunity "for refreshment, new experience, uninterrupted study and research, or travel." Because of the length of faculty careers, Bowen and Schuster consider the professoriate to be particularly

vulnerable to burnout. In an effort to counter that effect, the paid leave provides an opportunity for "personal refreshment and professional development," with the assumption that the value of the faculty member will be enhanced through the experience.

Zahorski (1994) notes that in the years between the first sabbatical granted at Harvard in 1880 (Eels,1962) and the sabbaticals examined in this study, at times the survival of the sabbatical leave has been threatened and at other times the fundamental purpose has been changed quite dramatically. He informs us of the Ingraham and King study conducted in 1965, in which they found that the most frequent reason faculty took leaves was to complete graduate work toward the doctorate and states that fourteen years later in a similar study, Daugherty found that 74.2% of all sabbatical granting institutions were still granting sabbaticals for the purpose of completing graduate degrees. This provides another distinct purpose for the faculty sabbatical.

Zahorski adds yet another model for analysis that results from his examination of institutional sabbatical policy statements. He identifies four stated purposes: to provide opportunity for scholarly enrichment; to improve teaching; to promote course and curriculum development; and to enhance artistic performance and creative growth.

It is no wonder that today the sabbatical leave is a mystery to those outside of academe. There appear to be a number of distinct definitions that have evolved within the academy during the last century. An objective observer might ask, what then is the purpose of the sabbatical? -- scholarly productivity?; personal refreshment and professional development?; teaching and curriculum improvement?; the pursuit of advanced credentials?; or some combination of the above listed purposes?

For this study, elements of each of the purposes identified in the literature provided a framework for the content analysis conducted for this study. A comprehensive set of present-day purposes emerge from the coded responses. This is elaborated further in the next two sections.

Research Design and Methods

In order to determine the reasons for and products of faculty sabbatical leaves, it was necessary to devise a structured mode of inquiry. Through the literature we identified a number of past reasons for and products of sabbatical that provide a framework for our investigation. Most often these descriptions were revealed through the use of surveys about the nature of the sabbatical. A summary of the reasons are listed as follows:

to conduct research (Rudolph; Bowen and Schuster; Zahorski);
to engage in uninterrupted study (Bowen and Schuster; Zahorski);
to write journal articles or a book (Rudolph; Zahorski);
to enhance artistic performance and creative growth (Zahorski);
to improve teaching (Zahorski);
to promote course and curriculum development (Zahorski);
for refreshment, new experience and travel (Bowen and Schuster);
to complete graduate work (Ingraham and King, Daugherty);

Some of the reasons were presented by more than one author, while other reasons seem to be forwarded by a single author. These reasons became our guide for content analysis of faculty sabbatical applications and reports.

To establish a description of the reasons for the sabbatical we used the sabbatical application and the sabbatical reports of the institution over a three year period. The sabbatical application included information about the **intended** reason for the sabbatical, and within the sabbatical report the faculty member included information about the **actual** activities of the sabbatical. The sabbatical report was also used to determine the products of sabbatical. This post-sabbatical report required that faculty indicate what benefits were derived from the sabbatical leave.

We decided to examine the applications of three academic years -- 1991, 1992 and 1993. A total of 193 faculty submitted sabbatical applications that were approved during the period being studied. Initially a preliminary content analysis was conducted using one-third of the applications. This preliminary analysis of the data was used to establish the coding scheme for the analysis of the applications as well as the sabbatical reports. We identified eight categories of anticipated and actual sabbatical activities: 1) to learn a new research technique; 2) to develop research; 3) to conduct research; 4) to study; 5) to write a book, monograph, or journal articles; 6) to conduct reviews, design procedures, or to create art work; 7) to develop courses or curricula; 8) to present research to colleagues. While these categories line up rather well with the documented reasons reviewed earlier, the initial content analysis was not strictly confined to the reasons identified in the literature and as a result allowed us to make some finer category distinctions. Once this framework was established, the content analysis of 193 sabbatical applications and 125 sabbatical reports was conducted.

The next section reviews the results of the investigation of the sabbatical applications and reports in an attempt to answer the following questions:

Of the tenured and tenure-track faculty who were at the institution during the 1991 through 1993 academic years, how many were eligible for sabbatical, and how many were granted sabbatical leave?

How many completed their sabbatical?

Of those faculty whose applications were approved, what did they propose to do?

What did the faculty actually do while on sabbatical leave?

What was the scholarly benefit to students, the university, and the public?

Answers to these questions reveal the purposes that sabbatical leaves serve, the procedures that are followed, and provide information designed to forward substantive recommendations for the development of sabbatical policy.

Results

During the 1992-93 academic year there were a total of **1,462** tenured and tenure-track faculty, however, not all faculty are eligible for sabbatical leave. There are a number of conditions under which a year-long or semester-long leave may be taken for full or partial salary, but only those faculty members with at least three service-years at the university are eligible to apply for leave. During the 1992-93 academic year **1,229** had served the university for at least three years. Of that total, **652** faculty were from the non-health sciences colleges and **577** were from the health sciences colleges. The data for 1992-93 is representative of the profile for eligible faculty for each of the three years being investigated.

During the three academic years being studied (1991-93), **193** faculty members applied for and were granted a sabbatical leave at the campus level. Sixty-eight (**68**) in 1991-92, **60** the second year, and **65** the third year. Of the original 193, **164** faculty members actually completed the sabbatical, 23 canceled their sabbatical at their request, 4 resigned their positions at the institution, and 2 faculty members were deceased. The average number of faculty who completed the sabbatical each year was 55. This figure represents approximately 3.8 % of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty, and 4.5 % of the faculty who were eligible for sabbatical. It is also important to note that of those who completed the sabbatical, 68% of the faculty were on leave for only **one semester**.

What was the intended purpose of the sabbatical leave?

Each of the 193 faculty who were granted the sabbatical leave submitted an application with an explanation of what they intended to accomplish during the leave. Table 1 is a summary of their responses.

Table 1

Faculty Sabbatical Leave

Primary Anticipated Activity

Activity	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	Total	%
Learn a New Technique	2	4	4	10	5
Develop Research	9	5	3	17	9
Conduct Research	32	23	40	95	49
Study	14	9	1	24	12
Write	11	19	10	40	21
Reviews, Art Work	0	0	5	5	3
Courses, Curriculum	0	0	2	2	1
Presentations	0	0	0	0	0
Total	68	60	65	193	100

Examination of this data revealed that most faculty intended to use the sabbatical primarily as an opportunity to conduct research (49%) or to write (21%). The next largest categories were related to the development of scholarship and included the use of the time to study (12%); to develop research (9%); or to learn a new research technique (5%). Three percent of the faculty indicated that they intended to use the time to conduct reviews, design procedures or to create art work. One percent indicated that they would use the time to develop courses or curricula. None of the respondents indicated that they would use the time to make presentations to colleagues.

It is interesting to note that within the sabbatical application, faculty were asked to indicate where they will take the sabbatical leave. This provided an opportunity to determine whether there was any relationship between the sabbatical activity and the location where it was being carried out. Table two displays a tally of the faculty responses regarding the intended location of the sabbatical activity.

Table 2

Location of Sabbatical Activity

as Reported by Faculty

1991-1994

Activity	City/State	USA	International
Learn a New Technique	6	5	6
Develop Research	12	1	7
Conduct Research	51	25	51
Study	13	6	10
Write	35	7	13
Reviews, Art Work	2	1	3
Courses, Curriculum	1	1	1

For those faculty interested in learning a new research technique, while there was some expectation that their efforts would be carried out locally, they most often expected to collaborate in the learning process with colleagues at other U.S. institutions or outside of the country. Those whose research was in the development stage most often did their work locally with some interest in developing research outside the U.S.. Over half of the faculty using the sabbatical to conduct research expected that some aspect of this research would be carried out locally, however, often these efforts were coupled with travel to another U.S. or international location in an effort to keep their research program on the "cutting edge." In fact, the investigation of the

location of the leave revealed that all categories of activity, with one exception, faculty were relying on the opportunity to work with colleagues in another U.S. state, or in another country to enhance their sabbatical leave activities. The exception was among those faculty who intended to use the sabbatical "to write." While some travel was indicated, in most cases the group who desired to use the leave to write had completed the data collection phase of their research, and now wanted to use the sabbatical to concentrate on publication and grant writing efforts.

What did the faculty actually do while on sabbatical?

Of the 164 faculty who completed the sabbatical, 125 submitted a post-sabbatical report. Of the 125, only 18 indicated any change in activity from the expectations listed when making application. Half of this group indicated that they wrote more than they had originally planned. About a third reported that they delivered talks or presentations. Two reported changes in travel plans, one changed the topic of study but not the activity, and another received a Senior Fulbright Fellowship. Four made note of added responsibilities such as involvement in organizing conferences or seminars, course development or service on a review panel. Only one indicated that he was not able to complete his research.

What was the scholarly benefit of the sabbatical?

In the 125 post-sabbatical reports, faculty detailed their sabbatical leave experiences and accomplishments. These reports were helpful in identifying the benefits of the sabbatical. A tally of the scholarly benefits reported by the sabbatical activity category is found in Table 3:

Table 3

Benefit of Sabbatical by Activity

Sabbatical Activity	Number of Faculty	Scholarly Benefit
To Learn a New Technique	5	8 Published Articles $395,000 for 3 years funded 19 Invited Lectures, Talks or Presentations 3 Grant or Research Proposals Created 1 New Course
To Develop Research	3	4 Published Articles 1 Book/Manuscript 2 Talks or Presentations Created 1 New Course
To Conduct Research	64	19 Books 10 Book Chapters 2 Monographs $65,000 for two years funded 36 Published Articles 46 Papers Submitted or in Progress 13 Grant or Research Proposals 10 Essays 56 Talks or Presentations 5 Courses Developed or Updated Composed Music
To Study	16	6 Books/Manuscripts 6 Chapters 6 Published Articles 8 Papers Submitted or in Progress 5 Research Proposals 3 Essays Written Composed music 3 Talks or Presentations

Sabbatical Activity	Number of Faculty	Scholarly Benefit
To Write	27	16 Books 4 Book Chapters 2 Monographs 25 Published Papers 9 Papers Submitted or in Progress 7 Essays 15 Grant or Research Proposals 3 Talks or Presentations 3 Courses Developed Organized a Conference
To Conduct Reviews, Design Procedures, or Create Art Work	2	6 Book Chapters 12 Published Papers 11 Talks or Presentations 1 Analytical Report
To Develop Courses or Curricula	1	2 Articles Written 3 Courses Developed

In total, the 125 faculty who submitted sabbatical reports indicated that the following "products" were directly attributed to the sabbatical: 42 books or manuscripts, 26 book chapters, 4 monographs, 91 published articles, 65 papers submitted for publication, 1,315,000 in secured research grants, 36 grant proposals submitted, 94 talks, presentations or invited lectures, 13 new or revised courses developed, 2 music compositions, 1 conference and 1 analytical report.

While it is obvious that various benefits are derived from each of the sabbatical activities, it should be noted that this is a conservative estimate of the benefits that accrue to the university. Two obvious examples are the grant dollars that will be brought in through the development of grant proposals during the sabbatical, and the improved classroom teaching and learning enhanced by course and curriculum development.

It is important to add that this study did not concentrate on the specific subject matter of the sabbatical activity. The faculty activities reflect the broad range of disciplinary interests of any university. While some of the activities were more specific to technical sub fields, most of the projects readily reveal the direct influence on the broader society, and included topics as wide ranging as the Russian transition to democracy; the study of the reduction of toxic materials in sewer systems; the design of English composition curricula; the study of advocacy and empowerment of persons with developmental disabilities; and research to better understand the functions of the red blood cell.

We also note that the majority of the reports either began or closed with a note of appreciation. Many faculty members expressed satisfaction with their level of productivity and were very appreciative of the opportunity to concentrate their efforts on publication and grant writing efforts.

Conclusions

This study revealed that a relatively small number of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty are on sabbatical during any one year -- 3.8%. Of the total faculty on sabbatical, 68% are on leave for one semester, allowing them to resume teaching and service related activities during that academic year. Of the 193 faculty who whose sabbatical requests were approved, 164 (85%) actually completed the sabbatical, and of that number, 125 (76%) submitted final sabbatical leave reports.

Most faculty intended to use the sabbatical primarily as an opportunity to conduct research (49%) or to write (21%). The next largest categories were related to the development of scholarship and included the use of the time to study (12%); to develop research (9%); or to learn a new research technique (5%). Three percent of the faculty indicated that they intended to use the time to conduct reviews, design procedures or to create art work. One percent

indicated that they would use the time to develop courses or curricula. None of the respondents indicated that they would use the time to make presentations to colleagues.

While there may be small changes in their plans, faculty carry out the activities and meet the goals originally identified in their application for leave. The tally of scholarly benefits reveals that the sabbatical is used primarily for the purpose of increasing scholarly productivity, and to disseminate information through presentations, talks and invited lectures. To a lesser degree the sabbatical is used to develop or revise courses or curricula, to engage in the creation of art, or to organize conferences or prepare analytical reports. The fact that there is relatively little change between the intended sabbatical activity and the actual activity suggests that faculty carefully plan the use of their sabbatical leave.

As for the tangible products of sabbatical, we found a rather impressive list: For the three year period the 125 faculty produced 42 books or manuscripts, 26 book chapters, 4 monographs, 91 published articles, 65 papers submitted for publication, 1,315,000 in secured research grants, 36 grant proposals submitted, 94 talks, presentations or invited lectures, 13 new or revised courses developed, 2 music compositions, 1 conference and 1 analytical report. Legislators or others who might question the value of the sabbatical leave and be inclined to conduct a cost-benefit analysis cannot measure all of the benefits. However, when questioning the value of the faculty in leaving the campus to carry out sabbatical leaves, there should be some consideration of the relatively small number of faculty who are on leave (3.8%), the brief time that the majority (68%) of the faculty are away -- one semester, and the list of tangible benefits that accrue from the activity.

The sabbatical leave applications and post-sabbatical reports proved to be valuable for this analysis. However, analyzing the activities of the sabbatical would have been a little more accessible if each report addressed various aspects of the sabbatical more consistently. While it is clear that the sabbatical is a valuable practice, the ability to describe these activities and their benefit to our stakeholders is an increasingly important element in retaining what is of value to

academe. The following recommendations focus on improved processes for better understanding and describing the activities and products of the sabbatical leave.

Broader Research Implications

A review of the literature revealed four purposes of sabbatical proposed by Rudolph, Bowen and Schuster, Ingraham and King, and Zahorski. Zahorski forwarded the most recent and broadest set of purposes stating that the sabbatical leave is to provide opportunity for scholarly enrichment; to improve teaching; to promote course and curriculum development; and to enhance artistic performance and creative growth. This study confirms that these are indeed the intended purposes, but makes some further distinctions, particularly in the area of "scholarly enrichment." We found that there were 5 areas of scholarly enrichment identified by faculty in their sabbatical applications: learning a new research technique; developing research; conducting research; studying; and writing. The primary value of this clarified definition of the purposes of faculty sabbatical leave is its use as further research is carried out using the sabbatical leave as a dependent or independent variable.

We also note that Zahorski provides the most recent reported definition of the purpose of the sabbatical. It is also the most consistent with our findings. While this may suggest that the findings are more reliable, it may also suggest that the purposes of the sabbatical leave shift over time to suit the needs of the academy. As a result, we may need to conduct such surveys and analyses periodically to ensure that we are truly knowledgeable of the purposes of the sabbatical leave.

Recommendations

On the institutional level, more emphasis must be placed on the timely submission of the post-sabbatical report. Regardless of the original purpose for sabbatical, the faculty member must have an opportunity to express the benefit of the sabbatical to them professionally, to their students, to the university, and whenever possible, to society. To that end, faculty should be encouraged to report according to a standard schema so that the full range of the sabbatical benefits can be understood and appreciated. Thus the institution could report not only on publications and grant applications, but on the talks and lectures delivered, curricula developed, and courses that are improved while faculty are on leave.

In the future, there should be more careful examination of the significance of the relationship between the sabbatical leave and travel. What part does travel to meet distant colleagues, different laboratories, or special libraries play in the ultimate value of the sabbatical?

Broader research recommendations would include the examination of the sabbatical leave across institutions. In addition it would be very interesting to compare the productivity of faculty on sabbatical leave with those who are carrying out their usual teaching, research and service responsibilities. Such a study might shed further light on the value of the sabbatical leave.

Bibliography

Bowen, H. and Schuster, J. *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York, 1986.

Daugherty, H. Jr. *Sabbatical Leaves in Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1979.

Eels, W.C. "The Origin and Early History of Sabbatical Leave." AAUP Bulletin, 48, 1962: 253-255.

Good, Carter V., editor. *Dictionary of Education*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

Ingraham, M., and King, F. *The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Lively, Kit. "Sabbaticals Under Fire," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2/23/94 vXL no.25.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1990.

The Faculty and Staff Handbook The University of Illinois at Chicago, 1992-94

Zahorski, Kennwth J. The Sabbatical Mentor: A Practical Guide to Successful Sabbaticals. Bolton: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 1994.